

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough examination of the above-referenced patent application. The Office Action, however, has tentatively rejected all pending/examined claims 12, 13, and 22. For at least the reasons set forth hereinbelow, Applicant respectfully request reconsideration of these rejections.

Independent claim 12 has been amended to more clearly identify a novel and non-obvious feature of the claimed embodiments. Specifically, among other distinguishing features, claim 12 has been amended to add the limitation of "...wherein the projection of the line segment is substantially parallel to at least one side of the hexagonal honeycomb pattern with a predetermined distance therebetween". Support for the limitation can be found in page 5, lines 5~21 of the specification and FIG. 2A. Accordingly, no new matter is added.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C 102(b)

Claims 12 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Takagi et al. (US 6,376,986) and Kuni et al. (JP 2000-011894). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections for at least the reasons discussed below.

Takagi and Kuni fail to teach or suggest the projections of alignment patterns are substantially parallel with a determined distance therebetween.

Among other defining features, independent claim 12 recites a front substrate having a first pattern comprising "at least one line segment installed on the predetermined assembling position thereof," and a rear substrate having a second pattern comprising at least one hexagonal honeycomb pattern formed with rib barriers

installed on the predetermined assembling position thereof, "wherein the projection of the line segment is substantially parallel to at least one side of the hexagonal honeycomb pattern with a predetermined distance therebetween." It is clearly expressed that the line segment (first alignment pattern) projected onto the hexagonal honeycomb pattern (second alignment pattern) is substantially parallel to at least one side thereof with a predetermined distance therebetween.

In contrast, Takagi teaches the projections of the main electrodes Xq and Yq (first alignment pattern) are perpendicular to the hexagonal honeycomb partition 29 (second alignment pattern) (see e.g., FIG. 13). For at least this reason, independent claim 12 patently defines over Takagi.

With respect to Kuni, the projection of the metal electrode 43 (first alignment pattern) is perpendicular to the septum 59 (second alignment pattern) (see FIG. 1). For at least this reason, independent claim 12 patently defines over Kuni.

Clearly, the cited references fail to disclose that the projections of alignment patterns are substantially parallel to one another with a determined distance therebetween.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references fail to disclose all the limitations of claim 12 (as amended). For at least this reason, independent claim 12 is allowable over the cited references. Insofar as claims 13 and 22 depend from claim 12, these claims are also allowable.

Although claims 14-21 have tentatively been withdrawn from consideration, with the allowance of claim 12, the Examiner should consider and allow claims 14-21.

No fee is believed to be due in connection with this Response to Office Action. If, however, any fee is deemed to be payable, you are hereby authorized to charge any such fee to Deposit Account No. 20-0778.

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Daniel R. McClure
Reg. No. 38,962

THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.
100 Galleria Parkway
Suite 1750
Atlanta, Georgia 30339-5948
(770) 933-9500